

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 8 are amended; claims 2 and 7 are canceled; and claim 9 is added. Support for the Amendment is found, for example, at page 6, line 16 to page 7, line 1 and in the original claims. Specifically, with respect to new claim 9, on page 6, it is disclosed that the fluorescent material layer provided on the front faceplate preferably has an average primary particle diameter of not more than about 0.5 μm from the viewpoint of high transmissivity. Thus, no new matter is presented.

Accordingly, upon entry of the Amendment, claims 1, 3-6 and 8-9 will be all of the claims pending in the application.

I. Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yoshinori (JP 08-162069)

Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Yoshinori (JP 08-162069).

Independent claim 1 is amended herein to incorporate the subject matter of claim 7, which is not included in the rejection. That is, Yoshinori does not disclose, teach or suggest the average primary particle diameter recited in amended claim 1. Thus, claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Yoshinori. Claims 3 and 5-6 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and are distinguished from Yoshinori for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §102 rejection.

II. Response to Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Yoshinori (JP 08-162069)

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Yoshinori.

Claim 8 is amended herein to depend from independent claim 1. As mentioned above, independent claim 1 is amended herein to incorporate the subject matter of claim 7, which is not included in the rejection. That is, Yoshinori does not disclose, teach or suggest the average primary particle diameter recited in amended claim 1. Thus, claim 8, as amended is not rendered obvious by Yoshinori for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

III. Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Ohsawa et al (US '826) in view of Murata et al(US '099) or Anandan et al (US '324) in view of Murata et al.

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ohsawa et al in view of Murata et al.

Claims 1-4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Anandan et al in view of Murata et al.

Claims 2 and 7 are canceled herein thereby rendering the rejection as to these claims moot.

Independent claim 1 is amended to include the subject matter of claim 7. With respect to the subject matter of claim 7, Anandan et al is silent regarding the element of the thickness of the fluorescent material of less than 7 μm , as admitted by the Examiner (see page 6, line 3

of the office Action dated February 17, 2006). Murata et al does not teach a fluorescent material provided on the front faceplate for the reasons set forth in the Amendment filed on December 20, 2005, which are incorporated herein. That is, an average primary particle diameter of a fluorescent material layer provided on a front faceplate is not more than that of a fluorescent material layer on a rear faceplate. Further, Murata does not teach that an average particle diameter suitable for improving the transmissivity of emitted light and does not even recognize this advantageous effect.

Accordingly, even if combined, the presently claimed invention would not have been achieved as recited in amended claim 1. Thus, the present invention is not rendered obvious by the combination of Anandan et al with Murata et al. Claims 3 and 5-6 depend from claim 1 and are distinguished over the art for at least the same reasons.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

IV. New Claim 9

New claim 9 is directed to the subject matter of amended claim 1 wherein the average primary particle diameter of not more than about 0.5 μm . None of the cited references disclose, teach or suggest all elements of new claim 9 for the reasons set forth above and therefore new claim 9 is distinguished over the art of record.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. App. Ser. No. 09/935,577

Atty Dckt. No. Q65912

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Jennifer M. Hayes
Registration No. 40,641

Date: June 1, 2006